

## REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-11, 13, 15, 17-19, 21-22, 24-25 and 29-39 remain in the present application. Claims 4, 7, 14, 16, 20 and 23 are cancelled herein. Claims 29-39 are added herein. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-11, 13, 15, 17-19, 21-22, and 24-25 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim additions and amendments. Additionally, Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter has been added as a result of the specification amendments. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

### Specification Objections

The specification is objected to as adding new matter. Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments made herein to the specification overcome this objection. Additionally, Applicants would like to point out that "layer 422" is supported, for example, by Figure 4 as originally filed.

### Drawing Objections

Figure 4 is objected to as reference character 422 is allegedly not mentioned in the specification as filed. Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments made herein to the specification overcome this objection.

### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-11, 15, 17-19, 21-22, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Number 6,529,188 to Suzuki (hereafter referred to as "Suzuki") in view of United States Patent Number 5,686,705 to Conroy et al. (hereafter referred to as "Conroy").

Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-11, 15, 17-19, 21-22, and 24-25 are not rendered obvious by Suzuki in view of Conroy for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1, which recites a display assembly for an electronic device comprising (emphasis added):

a display;  
a digitizer disposed above said display and for providing an input to said electronic device in response to a deformation of said digitizer; and  
a cover disposed above said digitizer and for enabling said deformation of said digitizer in response to a contact with said cover,  
wherein said cover overlaps a side of said display.

Independent Claims 10 and 19 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 1. Claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-9, 11, 15, 17-18, 21-22, and 24-25 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully assert that Suzuki fails to teach or suggest the limitations of a "wherein said cover overlaps a side of said display" as recited in independent Claim 1. As recited and described in the present application, a cover overlaps a side of a display (see Figures 3 and 4 of the present application).

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Suzuki to teach a touch panel assembly with *exposed* sides as shown in Figures 1A, 2A, 3A, 4, and 8-11. Assuming arguendo that the outer layers (e.g., element 4A as shown in Figure 1A of Suzuki) as taught by Suzuki are analogous to a cover as

claimed, Suzuki teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching a top layer which does not overlap a side of a display instead of a cover which *overlaps* a side of a display as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that Conroy, either alone or in combination with Suzuki, fails to cure the deficiencies of Suzuki discussed above. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Conroy also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of a “wherein said cover overlaps a side of said display” as recited in independent Claim 1.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully assert that Suzuki fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “wherein said cover further comprises a decorative border” as recited in Claim 6, and similarly recited in Claims 15 and 22. As recited and described in the present application, a cover comprises a decorative border.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Suzuki to teach a display and touchscreen *without* a decorative border. Although the rejection cites elements 15 and 20 as depicted in Figure 11A as teaching a decorative border, Suzuki teaches that dashed line 15 depicts a display region and dashed line 20 depicts an input region (col. 14, lines 39-41). Applicants respectfully assert that regions for display or input are *not* borders as claimed. And even assuming *arguendo* that the periphery of either region was analogous to a border as claimed, Applicants fail to find any teaching in Suzuki that either periphery is a *decorative* border as claimed.

Applicants respectfully assert that Conroy, either alone or in combination with Suzuki, fails to cure the deficiencies of Suzuki discussed above.

Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Conroy also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of a “wherein said cover further comprises a decorative border” as recited in independent Claim 6, and similarly recited in Claims 15 and 22.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Suzuki in view of Conroy, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of record. Since independent Claims 10 and 19 contain limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1, independent Claims 10 and 19 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Since dependent Claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-9, 11, 15, 17-18, 21-22, and 24-25 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, dependent Claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-9, 11, 15, 17-18, 21-22, and 24-25 are also not rendered obvious by Suzuki in view of Conroy. Thus, Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-11, 15, 17-19, 21-22, 24-25 and 29-39 are therefore allowable.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-11, 15, 17-19, 21-22, 24-25 and 29-39 are in condition for allowance and Applicant earnestly solicits such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 7/19, 2007

Bmf

Bryan M. Failing  
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060